



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,586	12/27/2001	Tracee E.J. Eidenschink	1001.1459101	1707
28075	7590	07/01/2004	EXAMINER	
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC			NGUYEN, VI X	
1221 NICOLLET AVENUE			ART UNIT	
SUITE 800			PAPER NUMBER	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420			3731	

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/034,586

Applicant(s)

EIDENSCHINK, TRACEE E.J.

Examiner

Victor X Nguyen

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. In response to applicant's amendment of 3/23/2004, the examiner has removed all prior *35 USC § 112* rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-5, 11-13 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Jansen et al (U.S.6,368,316).

Jansen et al disclose in figs. 2 and 4-6, a catheter for use during a surgical procedure on a body, including: an elongate shaft (120); a raised/tread pattern (156) disposed on the outer surface (134). The raised/tread pattern comprises a plurality of diamond shapes (the pitch angle of item 156 can be characterized as a diamond shape). Note that the catheter of Jansen in fig. 6 is capable of improving the transmission of torque along the elongate shaft when torqued (see col. 3, lines 32-67)

Regarding claims 3-4, Jansen et al disclose the transmission of torque comprises a plurality of bearing points ("up and down" in fig. 6) that contact one another when the elongate shaft is torqued.

Art Unit: 3731

Regarding claims 5, 11-13 and 20-22, Jansen et al disclose in figs. 2 and 4-6, including: an elongate shaft (120); a raised/tread pattern (156) disposed on the outer surface (134). The raised/tread pattern comprises a plurality of bearing points ("up and down" in fig. 6) that contacts one another when the elongate shaft is torqued, and where the catheter is a guide catheter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-10 and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Jansen et al (U.S. 6,368,316).

Regarding claims 6-7 and 15-16, the recited claims, "the raised pattern is formed by laser ablation or by overmolding" is not given any patentable weight since this is a product by process limitations that are not constructed as being limited to the product formed by the specific process recited. In re Hirao et al., 535 F2d 67, 190 U.S.P.Q. 15. Whether a product is patentable depends on whether it is known in the art or it is obvious, and is not governed by whether the process by which it is made is patentable. In Re Klug, 333 F2d 742, 180 U.S.P.Q. 161 (CCPA 1974). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the raised pattern is formed by laser ablation or by overmolding, since a comparison of the recited process with the prior art process does not serve to resolve the issue concerning patentability of the product. Regarding claims 8-10 and 17-19, the recited claims "the raised pattern is

Art Unit: 3731

formed by hot die casting/embossing or by extrusion” is not given any patentable weight since this is a product by process limitations that are not constructed as being limited to the product formed by the specific process recited. In re Hirao et al., 535 F2d 67, 190 U.S.P.Q. 15. Whether a product is patentable depends on whether it is known in the art or it is obvious, and is not governed by whether the process by which it is made patentable. In Re Klug, 333 f2d 742, 180 U.S.P.Q. 161 (CCPA 1974). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to construct the raised pattern is formed by hot die casting/embossing or by extrusion, since a comparison of the recited process with the prior art process does not serve to resolve the issue concerning patentability of the product.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Jansen et al (6,368,316) in view of Moore et al (4,669,465).

Regarding claim 14, Jansen is explained as before. However, Jansen does not disclose the catheter is a balloon catheter.

Moore et al teach the catheter is a balloon catheter (fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 25-27).

Art Unit: 3731

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the same time the invention was made to modify Jansen by adding the catheter is a balloon catheter as taught by Moore et al in order to create an overall system with added capability into a body lumen.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments, see pages 5-6, filed 3/23/2004, with respect to 102 (b) rejection(s) of claims 1-5, 11-13 and 20-22 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made under Jansen et al. Examiner believes this new 102 (e) rejection meets all the limitations of claims 1-5, 11-13 and 20-22.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Pat. No.5,001,825 to Halpern

U.S. Pat. No. 3,612,058 to Ackerman

U.S. Pat. No.6,574,497 to Pacetti

U.S. Pat. No. 5,855,560 to Idaomi

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor X Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4898.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8-4.30 P.M).

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3731

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Victor X Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 3731

VN *VN*
June 25, 2004



JULIAN W. WOO
PRIMARY EXAMINER